

ADOLF WARSKI

The Paris Commune, the dictatorship of the proletariat and its “learned” conquerors in Poland



Table of content

<u>Translator's note</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>Adolf Warski, "<i>The Paris Commune, the dictatorship of the proletariat and its «learned» conquerors in Poland</i>"</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>I</u>	<u>6</u>
<u>II</u>	<u>13</u>
<u>III</u>	<u>18</u>
<u>IV</u>	<u>24</u>

Translator's note

Adolf Warski, (born Adolf Jerzy Warszawski, 1868-1937) was one most important activist and theoreticians of Polish workers' movement.

He joined the socialist movement in 1880s. He co-founded the Union of Polish Workers (Związek Robotników Polskich, in 1889) and the Social Democracy of Kingdom of Poland (SDKP, in 1893). He continued his activism after unification of SDKP with Lithuanian social-democrats into the Social Democracy of Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania (SDKPiL); from 1902 he was member of party's Main Executive. In 1915 he represented SDKPiL at the Zimmerwald Conference.

In December 1918 he coordinated SDKPiL unification with the Polish Socialist Party-Left (PPS-Lewica) into the Communist Workers' Party of Poland (KPRP, later Communist Party of Poland (KPP)). Member of Central Committee until 1924, when he was temporarily removed as a result of factional struggles; again in the CC from 1925 to 1929. He was one of the main leader of the "majority" faction, which pushed for widening of party's social base, especially through a united front with the reformist left.

From 1922 to 1927 he was editor-in-chief of "Nowy Przegląd" ("New Review"), party's main theoretical organ. In 1919 he served as a delegate to the Warsaw Council of Workers' Delegates; from 1926 to 1927 and from 1928 to 1929 he served as a deputy to Sejm (lower house of Polish parliament); during his second tenure he was also the chairman of the Communist Parliamentary Faction.

In 1929 he was purged from the party leadership with the rest of the "majority" from leadership. He moved to the USSR, where he worked for the Comintern. He was arrested and murdered as a "Polish spy" in 1937. He was officially rehabilitated in 1955.

*

In the article below, Warski engages in a polemic with the social democratic critics of the dictatorship of the proletariat and defends of Marxist theory of the state. The article "Komuna

Paryska, dyktatura proletariatu i jej «uczeni» pogromcy w Polsce” in Poland appeared under the pseudonym J. Jelski in the magazine “Nowe Społeczeństwo” No. 12, March-April 1919, pp. 1-16.

The basis of this translation: Adolf Warski, “Wybór pism i przemówień”, v. 2, Warsaw 1958, pp. 11-33. Text in square brackets and all footnotes added by the translator.

Adolf Warski

**The Paris Commune, the dictatorship of the
proletariat and its “learned” conquerors in
Poland**

I

“Of late, the German philistine has once more been filled with wholesome terror at the words: Dictatorship of the Proletariat. Well and good, gentlemen, do you want to know what this dictatorship looks like? Look at the Paris Commune. That was the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.”¹

This is what Friedrich Engels wrote on March 18, 1891, on the twentieth anniversary of the Paris Commune. This month will be the forty-eighth anniversary, and its political scenery has changed so much and so profoundly as the working world is now breathlessly experiencing its nearly one and a half year dictatorship in Russia and its dictatorship in Germany emerging from bloody confusion. And whatever the next fate and stages of these titanic class struggles will be, there is no longer any doubt that capitalist society has entered a period of constant social cataclysms which, sooner or later, in the alternating succession of victories and defeats of the proletariat, must end with the triumph of its dictatorship.

No wonder, then, that now wholesome terror and holy indignation are gripping not only the average German philistine. When we read today Thiers' words from 48 years ago, that he only wanted to “free Paris from the hideous tyrants that oppress it”, or that the Paris Commune was “ruled by only a handful of criminals” – it seems to us that these epithets have only just come from lips of today's diplomats against Soviet Russia or the Spartacists, or that they resound from the columns of daily newspapers that so profoundly characterize upheavals of the greatest historical significance.

When we mention the Paris Commune, which Engels called the dictatorship of the proletariat, we do not mean to say that it was the same dictatorship as the Russian Soviet Republic or as the present-day revolutionary movement in Germany may become. Certainly, as far as the hostile attitude of the ruling classes towards the revolution is concerned, little has changed and even the language of insults, as we see, has remained the same. In general, it is a characteristic feature of all class societies that the ruling classes, which are leaving the historical scene, are unable to understand their heirs. Feudal Europe also saw the Great French Revolution only as the embodiment of the devil and of all kinds of crimes. But apart from that, history does not repeat itself, and to claim that the Paris Commune and today's dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia are

¹ [F. Engels, 1891 Postscript to *The Civil War in France*](#). Warski slightly misquotes Engels: the latter scolds “the Social-Democratic philistine”, not the “German” one.

phenomena as similar in their historical content as two drops of water would be to erase from history nearly 50 years of world capitalist development and its consequences.

We do not intend here to discuss in detail the similarities and differences between the Paris Commune and the dictatorship of the proletariat of today. The tragedy of the external situation was undoubtedly the same. The Commune was established after eight months of siege by the Prussians and cut off from the rest of France and the world, patiently endured incredible hunger, and finally amid heavy, bloody fights with the attacking Versailles – it developed its brilliant ideas and measures that only the revolutionary working class could achieve and which gave reason for Marx to say that “within sight of that Prussian army, that had annexed to Germany two French provinces, the Commune annexed to France the working people all over the world”². The Soviet Republic, established after an exhausting war and amid general anarchy, began to raise the foundations of its future, being surrounded on all sides by all imperialist powers, both Central European and Coalition ones, and today, after the defeat of Austria-Hungary and Germany, Poland has the honor of belonging to enemies who like a boa constrictor surround the Soviets with a choking ring of hunger and unemployment, and apparently it wants nothing more than to defend the interests of its wisents-landowners³ in the East and play the role of a faithful Negro alongside the victorious Allies and the international stock exchange.

But despite the similarity – what a colossal difference in the conditions of the external environment! In 1871, Moltke could watch the Paris Commune with cold blood and soldierly indifference, while today his successor and conqueror of Russia, Hindenburg, cried with these words at a soldiers' rally:

“I never thought I would be afraid of Russia! And now I admit that I'm afraid of it. A terrible force, because a terrible, unknown to us so far and – at first glance – completely incurable disease is spreading from Russia to us”.

And whereas in 1871 the Germans were able to quickly and without any problems seize five billion francs of compensation in the form of contribution from beaten but rich France and with this rain of gold fertilize German stock exchange, trade and industry to an unprecedented extent, now the

² [K. Marx, *The Civil War in France*, ch. V.](#)

³ Żubry (“wisents” or “bisons”) were an informal grouping of large landowners from north-eastern part of the Second Polish Republic (western territories of modern Lithuania and Belarus). They opposed land redistribution, favored autonomy for the Vilnius region and supported an aggressive anti-Soviet foreign policy.

“powerful” coalition not only has been racking its brain over how to solve its squaring of the circle, i.e. how to further ruin the already completely ruined Germany and nevertheless collect its war spoils in the form of hundreds of billions from Germany and its former allies, no less ruined. Moreover, having sunk billions in Tsarist Russia and new billions to maintain the counter-revolutionary armies of the Denikins, Krasnovs, Czechoslovak and Polish troops, having burned their fingers on their own unsuccessful military expeditions against the Soviet government, the Entente powers are announcing a highly diplomatic, publicly funded contest among small states and statlets for the supply of human material, in other words – cannon fodder, in order to build a protective cordon sanitaire against this “terrible disease” that Hindenburg spoke about. The faster the Coalition troops go home, no longer willing to risk their necks for profits pleasing to the capitalists, the more difficult it will be for Foch⁴ to fill half of Europe with ranks shrinking day by day. In this pursuit of a bulwark against the revolution of the proletariat, the old diplomatic powers of the Entente made secret and – as they probably thought – very clever promises of golden mountains to Petlura, Masaryk, Dmowski and God knows who else. But Petlura, concluding some kind of pact with the agents of the Entente regarding eastern Galicia, on the condition that Ukraine throws itself at Soviet Russia, suffered the same little misfortune as the first socialist-nationalist government of the Ukraine, when a year ago it concluded a pact with Germany against Soviet Russia⁵: he was unseated by his own Bolshevik people and, having fled with his government from Kiev, he left the field open to the Ukrainian Soviets, without having time to throw a single soldier at the Russian Soviets! This would-be Samaritan woman is therefore herself seriously ill with the Bolshevik plague, and as for the Polish and Czech bourgeoisie, these two honorary candidates for third-rate members of the capitalist “League of Nations” are causing their allies the unpleasant inconvenience of tearing out each other's hair over the “disputed” borders and denounce each other of Bolshevism to their high-ranking protectors. Moreover, the Polish Sejm entered the contest for the supply of material from living human bodies for building of a barrier against the revolution, unanimously offering – together with PPS MPs – six age groups [*roczniki*]⁶ of Polish peasants and workers to the disposal of the generous Western Allies⁷. The only thing that matters is the price of this delivery. The more the revolution deepens in Germany and knocks on the door of France, the more insistent and ruthless the “magnanimous” protector of Poland becomes, and it responds

4 Ferdinand Foch (1851-1929) was a Marshal of France and Supreme Allied Commander from 1918 to 1920. In 1923 he received the rank of Marshal of Poland.

5 On January 27, 1918 a treaty was concluded in Brest-Litovsk by representatives of the Ukrainian Central Rada with the Central Powers (Germany, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, Turkey).

6 *Rocznik* (pl. *roczniki*) here means all people (concretely men) born in the same year.

7 The resolution was passed on March 6, 1919.

harshly to all the political whims of Polish boorishness: do you want Haller's division⁸, money, ammunition, Poznań, Gdańsk? – put yourselves first under Foch's orders. Do you want to defend "civilization", "culture" from "anarchy", capitalist property from social revolution? – you should know that in a capitalist society you don't get anything for free, you have to pay for everything. It is true that PPS MPs are still sulking, kicking, wagging their fingers. But whoever says A will inevitably also say B, and whoever, in order to supposedly gain Poland's independence, placed Piłsudski's legions under the command of the Hötendorfs⁹, Bernhardis¹⁰, Hindenburgs, renouncing Poznań and Gdańsk, will be even more reconciled with giving up not six age groups [*roczniki*], but the whole of Poland under Foch's orders for promises of Poznań, Gdańsk and the adjacent areas, even if they were only promises of Sir Zagłoba¹¹. Another thing is how long will last the patience of those masses, who so far follow the PPS and uncritically endure the imperialist adventurism of their leaders.

These few examples above prove the profound difference in the historical conditions in which the Paris Commune fought and Soviet Russia is fighting today. Between them lies the history of two human generations. On the one hand, capitalist development has managed to create such an inflamed tangle of national issues over this time and “balkanize” Europe so much that almost every point on its map will remain a never-quenched ember of new wars as long as the capitalist system with its eternal, inevitable and ever new issues of economic, trade, strategic “borders”. It is impossible to build a peaceful bourgeois Polish state without Gdańsk and the Silesian mines, unless this state is to be a caricature of capitalism and suffocate in its own misery due to the lack of opportunities for imperialist expansion, just as it is impossible to create a peaceful Czechoslovak state without prospects of such expansion, without giving it these Silesian mines and the outlet to

8 Józef Haller von Hallenburg (1873-1960) was a Polish military leader. During WWI he fought on the side of Central Powers on the Eastern Front. After the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk his unit broke the front-line into Russia and joined counterrevolutionary Polish armies. While in the former Russian Empire, Haller organized pogroms and White Terror. In July 1918, he arrived in France and began organizing Polish military units on the side of the Entente (the so-called “Blue Army”). In 1919, he arrived in Poland. He took part in wars against Ukrainians and the Soviets, as well as secured Eastern Pomerania for Poland. In Poland his troops continued engaging in reactionary violence. In 1922 Haller took part in nationalist hate campaign against the newly-elected “Jewish” president Gabriel Narutowicz (1865-1922; Narutowicz assassinated by a far-right terrorist after merely five days in office). From 1922-1927 he served as an MP of the Christian Union of National Unity (*Chrześcijański Związek Jedności Narodowej*, *ChZJN*; colloquially *Chjena*, pronounced like *hiena* – hyena). He didn’t support the 1926 military coup and become involved in the center-right opposition to the *Sanacja* regime. After Nazi invasion of Poland, he emigrated and joined the Polish government in exile. After the war he remained in Great Britain.

9 Franz Conrad von Hötendorff (1852–1925) was an Austrian field marshal and Chief of the General Staff of the Austro-Hungarian Army from 1914 to 1917.

10 Friedrich von Bernhardi (1849-1930) was a German general and reactionary military historian. He was a commander on the Russian front in 1914-1918.

11 Jan Onufry Zagłoba is a Falstaffian Polish noble from Henryk Sienkiewicz’s (1846-1916) trilogy of historical novels, taking place in 17th century Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

the sea, just as the imposed “peace” of capitalist Germany cannot be kept in check by taking away Silesia, Gdańsk, East Prussia, and by withdrawing German capitalism to the borders from over a hundred years ago, when the borders of 1914 were already too tight, just as it was impossible to impose the German and Wilsonian slogan of “freedom of the seas” on English capitalism, etc. etc. To drown the capitalist imperialism of modern states and states not in a social revolution, but in Wilson's empty phrases about “democracy”, “justice”, “eternal peace” and the “League of Nations”, which hides the desire of American capital for supremacy in the trust of imperialist powers – it means the same as wanting to destroy hell with the hands of Beelzebub; to block the path of imperialism without the dictatorship of the proletariat – it means the same as stopping the wheel of history or telling the Vistula to flow not downstream but upstream. Under these conditions, capitalist Europe would be doomed to constant international conflicts, it would not have the relative peace that it experienced from 1871 to 1914, on the contrary – it would have on its map a hundred points of eternal anxiety and anarchy of balkanized peoples, which would only intensify the rush of the working masses to social revolution, to finally put an end to border disputes.

On the other hand, nearly fifty years of capitalist development since 1871 have caused the "terrible disease" to affect not only Russia. All capitalist societies carry it in their wombs as a mature historical fetus, as a result of which Soviet Russia is not as isolated as the Paris Commune was. Admittedly, there is still a significant difference in that the former has a quite extensive territory of operation, while the latter could not leave the narrow confines of Paris. But this vast territory is deprived of the most important bases of modern production, coal, iron, cotton, and if the Soviet Republic has so far managed to successfully repel all the armed blows of the Entente and its own counter-revolution, the trade blockade with which English imperialism has surrounded it and which has caused Germany's defeat, is a more severe blow to proletarian Russia than any armed attack on it, and could sooner or later become its undoing. However, a long-term trade blockade is a double-edged sword, the reverse of which hits the attackers themselves, depriving them of sales and exchange markets, and on the other hand – the faster and more effectively the “terrible disease” spreads in Ukraine and the Urals, the more the economic horizon of the Soviets expands, the more the blockade ring loosens. And if the Russian Soviets catches enough breath to achieve the victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat in Germany, not only their cause, but the cause of the social revolution throughout Europe and therefore throughout the modern world will be won.

In the light of the historical experience of the Paris Commune, of Soviet Russia and of the struggles for the supremacy of the Councils of Workers' Deputies taking place in Germany, the question of the relationship of the proletariat to the state machine of the bourgeoisie at the moment of revolution emerged with particular force and clarity. As is known, Marx and Engels were of the opinion that the proletariat, after coming to power, simply inherits from the bourgeoisie its state machine – as a ready tool for carrying out its socialist revolution. When Marx's excellent *Declaration of the General Council of the International* on the French Civil War of 1871, which was the apotheosis of the Commune, was published, Marx's antagonist, Bakunin, celebrated, pointing out that the Paris Commune had acted not according to the prescription of scientific socialism, but according to the principle of anarchists, namely – it did not take advantage of the state machine of bourgeois society at all, but on the contrary – it started by first and foremost simply destroying it. Marx had too revolutionary a head to close his eyes to the facts, and at the first opportunity – in the introduction to the new edition of *The Communist Manifesto* – he recognized the validity not of anarchism, of course, but only of Bakunin's claim that the Commune did not use the state as its instrument of revolution and destroyed it, as he himself presented in his *Civil War*.

The commune, Marx says in his *Civil War*, was “the political form at last discovered under which to work out the economical emancipation of labor”¹². Not exactly. He could not have known that not the Commune, but the councils of delegates, representing only the working people, became the “political form at last discovered” by history, leading from the dictatorship of the proletariat to a socialist society. The commune was created by general elections. But despite this difference in “political form”, in the construction plan and in the intentions of the Commune and the Soviets, there is a striking similarity.

Both aimed not only at the destruction of the capitalist state in general. Just as the iron broom of the Soviets swept away democratic bourgeois parliamentarism in the form of the Constituent Assembly, so the Commune, in its own way and by its own means, wanted to bury parliamentary democracy. The commune were to

“be the political form of even the smallest country hamlet... The rural communities of every district were to administer their common affairs by an assembly of delegates in the central town, and these district assemblies were again to send deputies to the National Delegation in Paris, each delegate to

12 [K. Marx, The Civil War in France, ch. V.](#)

be at any time revocable... The few but important functions which would still remain for a central government were not to be suppressed... but were to be discharged by Communal and thereafter responsible agents”¹³.

Instead of the words: “community” or “commune” – put: “workers' council”, add to this that the Commune, like the Soviets, was not to be a parliament, but at the same time a legislative and executive power – and you will have more or less a sketch of the Soviet structure. There are no electoral or legislative periods, any delegate can be recalled at any time, the legislative and executive powers are united, so there is no parliament at all, there are no direct elections, so there is no democracy – shout indignantly the defenders of parliamentarism and democracy. And this very anti-parliamentary and anti-democratic constitution – how far it is from so clearly, so extremely democratic electoral law established by the people's cabinet of Mr. Moraczewski¹⁴ – this very constitution of the Commune with its indirect, multi-stage elections found an enthusiastic defender in Karl Marx. But Marx was not a metaphysician for whom “parliamentarism” and “democracy” are not categories of thought and action of the bourgeois era, but always, eternally, “in themselves” good, just, popular, socialist ones. While recommending to the proletariat everywhere and always to fight for parliamentarism and democracy during the period of bourgeois development, he did not hesitate for a moment to throw the same categories into the historical junkyard when the Commune was destroying the bourgeois state itself. Because Marx was a materialist and a dialectician, and nothing from the capitalist world was sacred to him.

13 [K. Marx, *The Civil War in France*, ch. V.](#)

14 Jędrzej Moraczewski (1870-1944) was a PPSD and PPS politician. On November 17, 1918, under pressure from Piłsudski, he replaced Ignacy Daszyński as prime minister. Moraczewski's cabinet, a coalition of social democrats and agrarians, was met with distrust from the left of the workers' movement, a wait-and-see attitude from the peasantry, and open hostility from the right, big capitalists and landowners (the failed coup attempt on January 4-5, 1919). Despite presenting itself as a moderate alternative to Daszyński's government, pressure from the right forced the cabinet to resign on January 16, 1919. It was replaced with a coalition cabinet with right-wing nationalists and conservatives.

II

For Polish communists, the memory of the Paris Commune is associated with the names of its generals, Dąbrowski and Wróblewski¹⁵, and with grateful memory of its many other Polish defenders. This is not just a historical memory, as it has a deep connection with our current international politics.

In his *Civil War* Marx wrote:

“Thiers, the bourgeoisie, the Second Empire, had continually deluded Poland by loud professions of sympathy, while in reality betraying her to, and doing the dirty work of, Russia. The Commune honored the heroic sons of Poland by placing them at the head of the defenders of Paris”¹⁶.

These heroic sons of Poland were the last epigones of our noble democracy, which for nearly 100 years after the first partition linked the cause of independence with every European revolution and sought the salvation of the homeland in all revolutionary battles, wherever in the West they took place. However, since Poland was drawn into the vortex of capitalist development, this type of noble democrat, this type of romantic knight-errant, who generously spent his blood in all European revolutions to which his imagination attached the cause of Poland, disappeared. It disappeared with the final bankruptcy and disappearance of European bourgeois democracy, which also put forward in its revolutions the slogan of nation-states. First of all – the slogan of the resurrection of Poland.

The proletariat appears on the international arena, the European revolutionary movement becomes a socialist-class movement. The First International also raises the question of Poland, but by linking it with the revolution of the proletariat, it more and more radically purges from the noble skulls the

15 Jarosław Dąbrowski (1836-1871) was a Polish revolutionary. In the early 1860s, during his military studies in Petersburg, he became involved in conspiratorial officer movement. He took part in preparations to what become the January Uprising (1863-4), however he was arrested in 1862 and didn't took part in the hostilities. In 1865 he escaped from Siberian exile and emigrated to France. During the Franco-Prussian War he tried to organize a Polish Legion on the side of France. When the Commune broke out, he sided with the Communards and became the main commander of Commune's forces. Fallen on May 23. Buried in Père Lachaise Cemetery.

Walery Wróblewski (1836-1908) was a Polish revolutionary. Took part in the January Uprising as part of its radical “Red” faction. After the fall of the uprising he emigrated to France. During the Franco-Prussian War he defended besieged Paris in the National Guard. Took prominent part in the Paris Commune. After the fall of the Commune, he emigrated, first to Belgium, then to London. In London he became an active member of the First International; he met and befriended Marx and Engels. In 1877 he organized a Polish legion in Geneva, which fought against Russia in the Russo-Turkish War. After amnesty, in 1881, he returned to France. In 1895 he joined the Foreign Union of Polish Socialists (since 1900 – Foreign Section of the PPS). He was buried in Père Lachaise Cemetery.

16 [K. Marx, *The Civil War in France*, ch. V.](#)

will to unite with the International. Long before the formation of the latter, still in the era of the international “Union of Communists”, on November 29, 1847, Marx, on the anniversary of the November Uprising, spoke at a meeting organized in London by the “Fraternal Democrats”¹⁷:

“Old Poland has perished and we would be the last to wish for its restoration. But it is not only the old Poland that is lost. The old Germany, the old France, the old England, the whole of the old society is lost. But the loss of the old society is no loss for those who have nothing to lose in the old society, and this is the case of the great majority in all countries at the present time”¹⁸.

As we have already said, the old, revolutionary type of noble democrat sank along with feudal Poland in the flood of capitalist development, perished in the tumult of modern class struggles. But it can and should also be said with equal justice that the type of noble democrat was revived in the form of Piłsudski and similar former and current PPS leaders, but this type was thoroughly melted down and re-melted into its historical opposite in the fire of modern class struggles; the clang of his weapon can be heard today from the other side of the barricade, his blood isn’t spilled where history forges the continuation of the Paris Commune and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The place of the former revolutionary noble democrat in all the outposts of the world-class movement was taken by the Polish proletarian, whom we saw in Zimmerwald and Kienthal, and now we meet in the Soviets, we admire in his dashing and bloody charges against Yaroslavl, the Don or the Urals, we see him in the first ranks of the German revolution, we find him among the murdered Spartacists, we recognize or sense him in the Parisian atelier, in the London workshop¹⁹ and everywhere where the workers' revolution is maturing.

A new type of Pole-revolutionary has entered the arena of world class struggles, who, in the fighting ranks of the Red Warsaw Regiment, sets off from Moscow on the trenches of capital, singing about himself: “We grew out of these Masurian fields, Warsaw cellars of hell...” This is not a narrow characterization of the party type, it is a social type, a clear characterization of the entire class. So justice forces us to admit that he is not only a Polish Communist, but also among the living mass of

17 “Fraternal Democrats” was an international democratic association founded in London in November 1845. The association included the left wing of the Chartist movement and revolutionary political emigrants from the European continent.

18 [*K. Marx, On Poland. Speech at the International Meeting held in London on November 29, 1847 to mark the 17th Anniversary of the Polish Uprising of 1830.*](#)

19 English word used in the original text.

proletarians in general, who “grew out of these Masurian fields, from the Warsaw cellars of hell”, and therefore also a large number of PPS members, “Fraks”²⁰, who pay tribute of their hard work to the Russian revolution and devote especially much bloody effort to the Soviet Red Guard, reasoning rightly or sensing instinctively that the grave of Soviet Russia would sooner or later have to become the new grave of Poland. But this is not the PPS.

There was a time – it may seem to many today that it was probably a century ago – when the Polish Socialist Party, following the example of the old noble democrats, linked the cause of Poland with the cause of the European revolution, often proclaiming that Poland's salvation lies in the camp of the international proletariat, is inextricably intertwined with its victory. However, the first contact with the harsh reality of great, mass class struggles, the first workers' revolution of 1905, was enough to take away forever from the then and today's leaders of the “Revolutionary” Faction of the PPS the desire to associate the Polish cause – as they understood it – with the cause of any “foreign” revolution. And Daszyński did not even need the experience of the proletarian state to convince himself that the workers' revolution leads not to the Poland of his dreams, not to the building of a bourgeois state, but quite the opposite – to the crushing of this state along with its “just” territorial borders. Guided by the invariable instinct of the petty-bourgeois ideologue of “socialism”, who in decisive historical moments always escapes from the courage and consistency of his own thought, or rather from the specter of his own revolutionary phraseology, already in 1905, in an *Open letter*²¹ to the C[entral] W[orker's] C[ommittee] of the PPS, he decided for himself

20 *Frak* was a colloquial name for the member of the Polish Socialist Party – Revolutionary Faction (*Polska Partia Socjalistyczna – Frakcja Rewolucyjna, PPS-FR*).

During decades preceding WWI the two main Marxist parties in the Polish areas of the Russian Empire were the Polish Socialist Party (*Polska Partia Socjalistyczna, PPS*) and the Social Democracy of Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania (*Socjaldemokracja Królestwa Polskiego i Litwy, SDKPiL*). The parties were split over the question of Polish independence – PPS supported the struggle for independent Poland, while SDKPiL rejected national-liberation struggle. After the First Russian Revolution, PPS suffered a split over the relation of Polish socialism to the Russian revolutionary movement. PPS-FR supported struggle for independent Poland, which it saw as separate from struggle to overthrow the monarchy. Polish Socialist Party – Left (*Polska Partia Socjalistyczna – Lewica, PPS-Lewica*) considered Polish struggle as hopeless without an all-Russian anti-Tsarist revolution and championed unity with the Russian revolutionary movement and struggle for a republican Russia with national autonomy and rights for national minorities.

During WWI PPS-FR (which returned to the original PPS name in 1909) sided with the Central Powers and cooperated with Polish bourgeois parties. After the war PPS became a reformist party.

PPS-L and SDKPiL adopted an internationalist stance during WWI. On December 16, 1918 both parties organized a joint congress and merged into the Communist Workers' Party of Poland (*Komunistyczna Partia Robotnicza Polski, KPRP*)(in 1925 party dropped “Workers” from its name).

21 The letter of Ignacy Daszyński – the founder and leader of Polish Social Democratic Party of Galicia and Cieszyn Silesia (*Polska Partia Socjaldemokratyczna Galicji i Śląska Cieszyńskiego, PPSD*) – addressed to the leadership of PPS. This letter was published on January 3, 1906 in the PPSD's official newspaper, “Naprzód” (“Forward”). In his enunciation, Daszyński spoke in favor of the national-liberation struggle in Poland, separate from the revolutionary movement in Russia.

and the future “Faction” that the Russian revolution is not “our” revolution, and therefore the Polish worker should not take part in it, but wait for his chance.

From then on, the statement that Poland's cause rests irrevocably and only in the camp of the international revolutionary proletariat became in the minds of the leaders of the Rev[olutionary] Faction of the PPS a completely empty phrase, and as a phrase it went where it should have gone a long time ago: into this party's junk room of historical mementos. What was the only and truly revolutionary jewel of the old PPS's thought before 1905 – the connection of the Polish cause with the European revolution – now belongs to the most unpleasant mementos, completely unmentioned by today's leaders and writers of the “Faction”. And if at this moment we are bringing this memento out of historical hiding into the light of day, it is not with the intention of making anyone feel sorry for seeing it, but only to state that today the honor of representing the idea of Poland's connection with the revolution in other countries has gone exclusively to the communist party.

Even before 1914 the leaders of the Revolutionary Faction of the PPS did not even wait for the opportunity to document that their only hope was in the imperialist war: they were already preparing for it when the International Congress in Basel in 1912 declared war against the imperialist war, and in doing so they managed to betray the Second International even before the latter had time to betray itself and its solemn resolutions in Stuttgart and Basel²². After the outbreak of the war, they went to fight for Poland under the wings of German imperialism with the same holy faith in the beneficial effects of this “alliance” with which they believed at the end of 1916 in the November proclamation²³ of both “magnanimous” emperors. After reading at least a few lines of

Ignacy Daszyński (1866-1936) was a Socialist political activist in Austria-Hungary and Poland. He became involved in the worker's movement in 1889. In 1892 he co-founded the PPSD; he also became its representative in the leadership of the Social Democratic Workers' Party of Austria (SDAPÖ). He served as member of Austrian parliament from 1897 to 1918 and of Cracow city council from 1902 to 1919. Before WWI PPSD began close cooperation with the PPS-FR; in 1912 PPSD took a class and national collaborationist line, supporting Central Powers in event of a war with Russia and creation of a “triple monarchy” (Austria-Hungary-Poland). During WWI Daszyński took part in the legionary movement. On November 7, 1918 he became prime minister of the so-called “people's government” in Lublin. On November 17, under pressure from Piłsudski, he was replaced as prime minister by Jędrzej Moraczewski. In 1919 PPSD merged into united PPS and Daszyński became member of party's General Council. He served as member of Sejm (Poland's lower house of parliament) from 1919 to 1935. In 1920 he served as vice-premier in National Defense Government. He initially supported Piłsudski's 1926 military coup, before becoming one of the most vocal critics of the *Sanacja* dictatorship.

22 The International Socialist Congress in Stuttgart (August 18-24, 1907) adopted a resolution regarding the attitude of socialists to the war. The resolution stated that in the event of an imperialist war, socialists should take advantage of the political and economic crisis in their countries caused by the war to prepare a socialist revolution. The Extraordinary Congress of the Second International in Basel (November 24-25, 1912) confirmed the resolution adopted in Stuttgart and adopted the Manifesto on the War.

23 On November 5, 1916, a proclamation was announced in Warsaw and Lublin by the emperors of Germany and Austria-Hungary regarding the future of the lands of the former Russian partition. The proclamation announced the creation on these lands of a Polish rump state with a hereditary constitutional monarchy, linked to Germany and

what the “Frak” press wrote about this proclamation, one can say, without even a hint of exaggeration, that they believed in it much more strongly than the National Democrats once did in the miracle-working significance of Nikolai Nikolaevich's proclamation²⁴. Now, with no less faith, they desire a “close”, “as close as possible”, “cordial” “alliance” with the imperialist Entente and, rushing into the arms of the Western stock exchanges, they turn against Germany, the burning flame of the proletarian revolution, with the same impetus, with which they connected with it when it was still only the junker-kaiser Germany. It should be said that these alliances were and are quite “innocent”, because the “alliance” of Piłsudski, the Rev[olutionary] Faction of the PPS (and the entire Cracow S[upreme] N[ational] C[ommittee]²⁵), or even the “alliance” of poor and weak Poland as a whole— once with the imperialist trust of the Central Powers, the second time with the identical trust of the Western States – can at best be only an alliance of the sheep and the wolf, in any case it was and is only the relationship of the lackey to the master, it has always degraded and it degrades now the Polish people and it absolutely means giving Poland over once to the stock exchanges and junkers of the Central Countries, and a second time to the stock exchanges of Paris, London and New York. But it is also fair to admit that in this policy the leaders of the “Faction” were as faithful to themselves and as consistent during this period as never before: namely, they always firmly, inflexibly, fearlessly held on to the coattails of some imperialism. The revolution in other countries, which was once supposed to be a lever for Poland's independence, is now considered a mortal enemy in their eyes, just like in the eyes of the National Democrats and the entire Polish philistinism.

Austria.

24 The appeal to Poles issued on August 14, 1914 by the commander-in-chief of the Russian troops, Grand Duke Nikolai Nikolaevich, calling for support for Russia in the war; it announced that Poland would be granted some autonomy within the Russian state.

25 On August 16, 1914, the Supreme National Committee (Naczelny Komitet Narodowy, NKN) was established in Cracow by representatives of Polish political parties operating in Austria, whose task was to organize Polish legions to fight Tsarist Russia on the side of Austria-Hungary. From November 1914, the NKN included representatives of parties from Congress Poland.

III

The Socialist Party, which once boasted of its solidarity with the international revolutionary movement, still today inscribes on its publications the great emblem of *The Communist Manifesto*: “Proletarians of all countries, unite!” – such a party cannot stop at the acts of betrayal alone, it must rather support them with some “socialist” theory and present the betrayal of the revolution in the glow of revolutionary virtue.

This great task was undertaken by the renewed “Przedświt”²⁶, which intends to “consolidate, deepen and develop the ideology of Polish socialism”. In the pages of “Robotnik”²⁷ and at the meetings of the Warsaw Council of Workers' Deputies²⁸, Mr. Zaremba²⁹ tirelessly tells us the terrible news, namely that Polish communists are not Marxists at all and that the honor of possessing all the secrets of scientific socialism belongs exclusively to the PPS – of course to the “Revolutionary” Faction of it. For the scientific socialism of Marx and Engels states that the social revolution of the proletariat can only take place when proletarians-workers constitute the majority of society, and he, Zaremba, knows the four arithmetic operations thoroughly and also calculated precisely, arithmetically, as if on the palm of his hand that proletarians, especially in Poland, do not constitute the majority of society, because there is still a lot, probably even a significant majority, of peasantry. Therefore, not a social revolution, not a dictatorship of the proletariat, as our communists want, but a workers' and peasants' government of the Moraczewski cabinet type is today the last word of scientific socialism in Poland. In the December issue of “Przedświt”, Mr. A. Czarski³⁰, who is

26 “Przedświt” (“Before Dawn”) was the theoretical organ of the PPS-FR published from 1907 to 1920. In the period from May 1916 to November 1918, there was a break in publishing. The first issue of the renewed “Przedświt” was published in December 1918.

27 “Robotnik” (“The Worker”) was the main newspaper of the PPS published from 1894 to 1939.

28 The first Soviet organization in Warsaw – the Council of Workers' Deputies of Warsaw – began its sessions on November 11, 1918. It brought together the most important workers' parties and organizations – except for the “Fraks”. The latter organized their own council – the Workers' Council of Warsaw – which began its sessions on November 21. The sectarian policy of the PPS-FR was criticized not only by other workers' parties, but also by its own rank and file. The “Frak” leadership gave in and agreed to create a joint council. After the elections and deliberations were repeatedly postponed by the “Fraks”, the Warsaw Council of Workers' Deputies finally began its deliberations on January 3, 1919. The PPS, which received plurality of the seats, sabotaged its activities throughout the Council's existence and tried to limit the scope of its authority. PPS delegates finally left the Council in June 1919. Under conditions of bourgeois state repression (KPRP – second strongest party – became illegal in February), the activities of the Warsaw Council of Workers' Deputies ceased in the summer of 1919.

29 Zygmunt Zaremba (1895-1967) was a PPS activist and publicist. He joined the PPS in 1912. He represented the left wing of the party. After regaining independence by Poland, he consistently opposed PPS alliances with bourgeois parties, and at the same time, unlike the rest of the party left, he opposed a united front with the communists. During World War II, he was a member of PPS-WRN (*Polska Partia Socjalistyczna-Wolność, Równość, Niepodległość*; Polish Socialist Party-Liberty, Equality, Independence), representing the right wing of the party. After the war, he emigrated to France and was active in the “PPS in exile”.

30 Zaremba's pseudonym (unknown to Warski).

equally thorough in the science of addition and subtraction, seconds Zaremba and deepens Marx's teachings:

“The old premise of the proletariat's struggle for socialism was the completion of the process of proletarianization of the masses and taking power into the hands of the proletariat – its dictatorship. Against this background of an unfinished process, the construction of a socialist system must be realized in other forms...

Economic life after the overthrow of the bourgeoisie's rule must be shaped on socialist foundations, but the political forms of governing the country must be different than those predicted by the theorists of socialism and called by them the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The existence of an economically and numerically strong peasantry creates the need to divide power between the proletariat and the peasantry...

When Marx formulated the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat, he spoke of it as the dictatorship of the majority. We don't have this...

So – the author concludes – there is a need for what has already been done in Poland: a workers' and peasants' government”³¹.

So: “The old premise of the proletariat's struggle for socialism was the completion of the process of proletarianization of the masses”.

What is “the completion of the process of proletarianization”, after which the fight for socialism was to begin? Where, in what writings of Marx and Engels, did our learned expert in scientific socialism find this wise “old premise”?

*Ex ungue leonem!*³² After this tail-swipe in the field of theory, you can recognize the lion of “Frak” scholarship. As we know, after the outbreak of the November Bolshevik Revolution, every coffee shop philistine and every rag immediately became a defender of scientific socialism and questioned Bolsheviks' socialist honor and faith because they did not want to wait for “the completion of the

31 A. Czarski, *Dyktatura proletariatu czy ludowładztwo?*, “Przedświt”, December 1918, p. 16 18.

32 (You can tell) A lion by his claws.

process of proletarianization” and to introduce the dictatorship of the proletariat only when almost whole of the people will consist of workers and only very, very few capitalists. What the arithmetic expression of “the completion of the process of proletarianization” is supposed to be, what kind of numerical ratio of workers to capitalists, 99 to 100 or a million to one, is not given by either “Przedświt” or any rag, but the philistine can have the pleasure of being able to dream blissfully about these beautiful times when “the completion of the process of proletarianization” will take place.

This belief of Mistery Zaremba, Czarski and comrades gave them a pleasant awareness and a gratifying feeling that now only they represent scientific socialism in Poland. Because if these scholars drank even a little from the sources of this socialism, they would learn that the opposite is true: for Marx and Engels, not the completion of the proletarianization process was the premise for the dictatorship of the proletariat, but the other way around – only the dictatorship of the proletariat will stop the process of proletarianization, will be the premise for its completion. The process of capital accumulation (which is also a process of proletarianization) in Marx's *Capital* or in any of his or Engels' other writings has no end at all, no other limit than the social revolution. In this respect, Rosa Luxemburg noticed a gap in *Capital*, which she filled in her work on accumulation³³ by establishing a theoretical limit, an objective restraints for the development of accumulation. Some experts on the works of scientific socialism, including Kautsky and Lenin, do not agree with R. Luxemburg and still believe that accumulation can take place endlessly, and therefore the process of proletarianization cannot have a “completion” at all. But neither the creators of scientific socialism nor Rosa Luxemburg and her critics ever thought that “the completion of the process of proletarianization” was a premise for socialism. And if Kautsky is now against the dictatorship of the proletariat, it has nothing to do with the scientific wisdom of Mr. Czarski, or with similar nonsense of no less self-satisfied coffee shop philistines.

If Mr. Czarski “deepens” Polish socialism in this way, then Mr. Niedziałkowski³⁴, perhaps an even more thorough expert in four arithmetic operations, deepens Mr. Czarski's science in the next issue of “Przedświt”, writing about the elections and the composition of the Sejm:

33 R. Luxemburg, [*The Accumulation of Capital*](#) and [*The Accumulation of Capital: An Anti-Critique*](#).

34 Mieczysław Niedziałkowski (1893-1940) was a Socialist activist. In 1910 he co-founded the Union of Progressive-Independentist Youth (Związek Młodzieży Postępowo-Niepodległościowej, ZMP-N). In 1914 he joined the PPS, in 1916 became part of its leadership and since 1919 until 1935 served as party's MP. He was the main theoretician of party's right-wing, he authored PPS's draft of the proposed Polish constitution (1919) and party's revised political program (1937). Shortly after the German invasion of Poland, he was arrested and executed by the Nazis.

“The more or less true balance of social forces in Poland came to light with full clarity, as if in a snapshot. A painful disappointment befell the youthful dreamers who, hour after hour, were waiting for the victorious outbreak of social revolution”³⁵.

How simple it is! The number of votes cast for each candidate and party is added and the result is “the more or less true balance of social forces”. The social revolution is slain. In truth, in the glow of these numbers there lies another corpse on the ground: the workers' and peasants' government, which did not receive a majority of votes in the elections and does not have it in the Sejm.

So far, science has known various worldviews: materialistic-dialectical, idealistic and other, more or less perfect or bad methods of studying phenomena. But no one has yet created an arithmetic way of looking at the world. This invention is the undisputed property and pride of the “consolidated, deepened and developed ideology of Polish socialism” from the camp of the Revolutionary Faction of the PPS. Indeed, it is difficult to shake off the painful impression that so often jumps from underneath Żeromski's³⁶ pen: “Polish poverty, our, Polish poverty!” And this mental poverty, this spiritual loutishness claims the role of a cultural pioneer in people's Poland!

If Misters Czarskis and Niedziałkowskis turned to any intelligent worker who had read Lassalle's lecture *On the Essence of the Constitution*, he would tell them:

Yes, gentlemen, it is true: everyone had the same vote during the elections. But in the “balance of social forces” not every vote has equal weight. For example, your people's government³⁷, when resigning, cried publicly that several or several dozen bankers had knocked it off the government pedestal with a simple, silent gesture, i.e. refusal of money. What does that mean? That means that the “balance of social forces” depends primarily on property relations and cannot be changed by ballots, but only by change of property relations. So even though there were tens or even hundreds of thousands of you, your supporters and your voters, and there were only a small handful of bankers, and although each of you had the same vote in the elections as a banker, the bankers turned out to be stronger than you and your government. And not only that depends on property relations,

35 M. Niedziałkowski, *Rzeczywistość*, “Przedświt”, January–February 1919, p. 2.

36 Stefan Żeromski (1864-1925) was a Polish novelist and dramatist. He sympathized with the socialist movement, although he never joined any party.

37 Moraczewski's cabinet (November 17, 1918 – January 16, 1919).

but the entire political and moral superstructure that is based on these relations. So a gendarme, a bishop, a general, a minister, a judge, a prosecutor have more weight in the relationship between social forces than a worker and a peasant, although they all have the same electoral vote.

I will tell you one more thing, gentlemen: even people who did not vote may have more weight in the relationship of social forces than three dozen of MPs or the entire Sejm. For example, General Dowbor-Muśnicki³⁸, who has soldiers and cannons under his command, constitutes a significant part of the balance of social forces, because he has considerable power in his hand. And who gave him this power? Piłsudski, who proposed him to the Poznań *endeks*³⁹ as one of three candidates for the commander of the local armed forces. And where does Piłsudski get such power? He has it because he still has a moral influence on part of the masses. Why does he still have this influence? Thanks to the fact that you also support him and pay him public tributes. So you see, gentlemen, that moral influence, politics and, in general, human will play a great role in the relationship of social forces, although these are impersonal things and they don't put ballots in the ballot boxes, just as money in a banker's cash register or a cannon under the orders of a general don't.

I will tell you more, gentlemen: Wilson, Lloyd George, Clemenceau, foreign stock exchanges and trusts, the Soviet Republic, the revolution in Germany now have more important weight in the relationship of social forces in Poland than your entire illustrious Sejm.

I will tell you even more, gentlemen: the "peace" policy of the Entente, together with your policy and your wars, can trigger a social revolution in Poland much earlier than the Polish communists could wish for, although your arithmetic thinking does not see it.

38 Józef Dowbor-Muśnicki (1867-1937) was a reactionary Polish general. During WWI he served in the Russian Imperial Army. After February Revolution he was involved in forming Polish military formations from the collapsing Russian army. After October Revolution he fought against the Bolsheviks. In 1918 Dowbor-Muśnicki troops took control of Babruysk in Belarus, unleashing waves of White Terror. During the Brest-Litovsk negotiations Dowbor-Muśnicki joined the German forces. In July 1918 Germans disbanded his forces and he returned in Poland. In 1919 he took part in the Greater Poland Uprising, organizing the Greater Poland Army, while purging the insurgent forces from leftist elements and disbanding soldiers' councils. In 1920, as a result of conflict with Piłsudski, he resigned from all his military posts and withdrew from public life.

39 Members of the nationalist National Democracy movement (*Narodowa Demokracja, endecja*). Its main leader and theoretician was Roman Dmowski (1864-1939). During partitions *endecja* opposed anti-Tsarist revolutionary activity, going as far as forming counterrevolutionary gangs during the Revolution of 1905. During WWI *endecja* supported fighting on the Entente side. Throughout its long history *endecja* engaged in anti-socialist violence and terror against national and religious minorities (especially Jews). During the interwar period more radical factions of *endecja* modeled themselves on European fascist movements.

And finally, I will tell you, gentlemen: socialists, even from your camp, taught me that basing political tasks on the combination of Sejm numbers is called parliamentary cretinism.

IV

But let us return to our learned conquerors of the social revolution, the true and only representatives of scientific socialism. As we already know, Mr. Czarski wrote:

“When Marx formulated the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat, he spoke of it as the dictatorship of the majority. We don't have this.”

Why we don't have this? Because Mr. Czarski's arithmetic shows “the unfinished process of proletarianization” and “the existence of an economically and numerically strong peasantry”.

At the end of 1847, in Germany and France, the process of proletarianization of the masses was even less developed, and the peasantry was even more numerous. Nevertheless, Marx and Engels had already written in *The Communist Manifesto*:

“You are horrified at our intending to do away with private property. But in your existing society, private property is already done away with for nine-tenths of the population; its existence for the few is solely due to its non-existence in the hands of those nine-tenths”⁴⁰.

Well, didn't the creators of *The Communist Manifesto* see the mass of the petty bourgeoisie and peasantry at that time, or maybe they didn't know arithmetic as well as our scholars from the “Przedświt” school?

In 1871, the vast, overwhelming mass of the working classes in France were small craftsmen and peasants, and the honest bourgeoisie, as Marx testifies, exclaimed at the sight of the Paris Commune: “This is communism, impossible communism!” – just like today our honest deepeners of scientific socialism in Poland. To this Marx replied in *Civil War*:

“It is... as if the capitalist society was still in its purest state of virgin innocence, with its antagonisms still undeveloped, with its delusions still unexploded, with its prostitute realities not yet laid bare. The Commune, they exclaim, intends to abolish property, the basis of all civilization!

40 [K. Marx & F. Engels, *The Communist Manifesto*, ch. II.](#)

Yes, gentlemen, the Commune intended to abolish that class property which makes the labor of the many the wealth of the few. It aimed at the expropriation of the expropriators. It wanted to make individual property a truth by transforming the means of production, land, and capital, now chiefly the means of enslaving and exploiting labor, into mere instruments of free and associated labor”⁴¹.

Well, didn't Marx know arithmetic when he said it was going to be a dictatorship of the majority?

We are apparently dealing here with the secret of scientific socialism, closed under seven seals to theoreticians from the Faction of the PPS. They, as petty-bourgeois socialists, look at the world from the point of view of the small property of the shopkeeper, craftsman and peasant, while scientific socialism talks about capitalist property, which is a means of “enslaving and exploiting labor” of both the worker, the shopkeeper, the craftsman and the peasant, which without owner's labor creates profit, rent, capital accumulation.

In one respect, the social revolution could certainly break out too early for them: those scientists who talk complete nonsense about scientific socialism with such nonchalance, with such self-confidence as only the ignorant can muster, would not have had time to skim any of it beforehand, as they haven't managed to learn its ABCs already.

Moreover, their theory is not solely the fault of their ignorance: to dress Moraczewski's people's government and the political practice of their party in the clothes of scientific socialism – such a task is beyond the strength of even more trained minds and cannot be achieved using the arithmetic method. How, for example, can we demonstrate “scientifically” that the Revolutionary Faction of the PPS is fighting Polish and world imperialism – sometimes in an “alliance” with the Central Powers, sometimes with the Entente powers? It is true that they shout – in chorus with the *endeks* – that Poland is threatened by the imperialism of Soviet Russia, but this cry of their parliamentary deputies and their “Robotnik” only implies that imperialism triumphs where the bourgeoisie is defeated and the enemies of imperialism are in the camp of capitalist governments. However, this “deepened” theory of capitalist imperialism has only one good side – it’s very flattering both for the policies of Dmowski and Daszyński, for both National Democracy and the PPS [–] Rev[olutionary] Faction, but at the same time it has the fatal flaw that it is scientific socialism’s theory of the sources

41 [K. Marx, The Civil War in France, ch. V.](#)

of imperialism turned upside down, or rather it is no theory at all, but just plain nonsense of our learned conquerors of the social revolution.

Therefore, they have no choice but to turn the revolutionary method of scientific socialism into a caricature, and its revolutionary practice into plagiarism without substance. Nobody probably suspects our “Fraks” of great sympathy for the Soviet revolution. But despite all their disgust for this revolution, they had to come to terms – at least temporarily – with the new that Russia had given to the world, and they taken, whether they wanted it or not, what the “Bolshevik” revolution had brought to their country: the Councils of Workers' Deputies. As is known, even General von Kessel⁴² and Field Marshal von Hindenburg came to terms with the fact of establishing soldiers' councils. However, having borrowed from the hated Soviet Russia this “the political form at last discovered” of the workers' revolution, our “Fraks” – just like the Scheidemannists in Germany – are trying to turn the workers' councils into gross plagiarism without life, without their proper historical content, they graciously allow them to be everything, whatever you want, as long as they're “not state organs”, as Mr. Czarski wants in “Przedświt”.

Our practitioners and scholars from the Rev[olutionary] Faction of the PPS went even further: they literally copied the formula of the “workers' and peasants’” government from the policies of the hated Russian Bolsheviks and turned this plagiarism into their own caricature in the form of Moraczewski's cabinet! Unfortunately, history is not made of plagiarisms or caricatures of thought; and just as Kerensky's government proved that the workers' councils could be temporarily suppressed, but their function as organs of the proletarian state could not be extirpated from them, so Moraczewski's cabinet showed that the caricature of a “workers’ and peasants’” government could only be a short-lived farce and nothing more.

Well, gentlemen, do you want to know what a workers' and peasants' government looks like? Look at the Paris Commune. It was a government of workers, petty bourgeoisie and peasants. True, it was not at all similar to its recent PPS caricature, because it was a dictatorship of the proletariat.

The Paris Commune, says Marx, “was essentially *a w o r k i n g c l a s s g o v e r n m e n t*”, but then he adds:

42 General Gustav von Kessel (1846-1918) was an adjutant of Wilhelm II and the governor of Berlin in during WWI.

“And yet, this was the first revolution in which the working class was openly acknowledged as the only class capable of social initiative, even by the great bulk of the Paris middle class – shopkeepers, tradesmen, merchants – the wealthy capitalist alone excepted. The Commune had saved them by a sagacious settlement of that ever recurring cause of dispute among the middle class themselves – the debtor and creditor accounts... But this was not their only motive for now rallying around the working class... In fact, after the exodus from Paris of the high Bonapartist and capitalist *bohème*, the true middle class Party of Order came out in the shape of the ‘*Union Republicaine*’ enrolling themselves under the colors of the Commune and defending it against the willful misconstructions of Thiers...

The Commune was perfectly right in telling the peasants that ‘its victory was their only hope’... The Commune... in one of its first proclamations, declared that the true originators of the war would be made to pay its cost. The Commune would have delivered the peasant of the blood tax – would have given him a cheap government – transformed his present blood-suckers, the notary, advocate, executor, and other judicial vampires, into salaried communal agents, elected by, and responsible to, himself. It would have freed him of the tyranny of the *garde champêtre*, the gendarme, and the prefect; would have put enlightenment by the schoolmaster in the place of stultification by the priest... Such were the great immediate boons which the rule of the Commune – and that rule alone – held out to the French peasantry. It is, therefore, quite superfluous here to expatiate upon the more complicated but vital problems which the Commune alone was able, and at the same time compelled, to solve in favor of the peasant...”⁴³

Well, gentlemen, do you still want to know what a workers' and peasants' government looks like? Look at Soviet Russia, from which the landowners disappeared and the land found itself in the hands of the peasants; look at Ukraine, from where Petlura's government is fleeing, although it was a government much more radical and better for the peasants than your Moraczewski's cabinet, and where the peasants are moving *en masse* to the Bolshevik camp.

You know what? Just keep working as you have been working so far, send six age groups [*roczniki*] of cannon fodder for the Entente in the Sejm, court the majority of MPs there through Daszyński's mouth, wage the war against Bolshevism together with the *endeks*, and the more thoroughly you

⁴³ [K. Marx, The Civil War in France, ch. V.](#)

will familiarize Polish workers in general and the workers from your own party with the practice of your "deepened" socialism, the sooner you will see a workers' and peasants' government in Poland.

It will be – a dictatorship of the proletariat.

